

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated March 17, 2008. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 5-12, and 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,981,223 (“Becker”) and U.S. Pat. No. 5,487,143 (“Southgate”). Claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Southgate and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,275,215 (“Werndorfer2”).

The rejections from the Office Action dated March 17, 2008 are discussed below. With this amendment, claim 20 has been amended for clarity, claim 21 has been cancelled, and claims 22-26 have been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**A. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, 12, 15-18 and 20**

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, 12, 15-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Southgate. Becker discloses a “graphical user interface 1200 consolidated into a single window pane set.” Becker, Fig. 12, col. 19, II. 33-35. Becker fails to disclose a resizable content displayed in a window, or maintaining a pre-programmed height for a friends list page displayed in a window, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 11. The Office Action acknowledges this by stating Becker “fail[s] to show the content has a minimum height and maximum height and the maintaining of a pre-programmed minimum height for the friends list page as recited in the claims.” Office Action dated March 17, 2008.

Southgate generally “provides an efficient way to manage windows where multiple windows are used and displayed.” Southgate, col. 5, II. 17-18. Independent claims 1 and 11 only recite one window, an instant messenger window. In the claims, the friends list page and first interactive content tab are displayed in the instant messenger window. Thus, Southgate fails to disclose a resizable content displayed in a window, or maintaining a pre-programmed height for a friends list page displayed in a window, as claimed in independent claim 1 and 11.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Southgate and the embodiment of Becker relied on by the Office Action. Southgate provides a way to manage windows where multiple windows are used and displayed (Southgate, col. 5, ll. 17-18), while the embodiment relied on in Becker discloses a graphical user interface consolidated in a single window pane set. Becker, Fig. 12, col. 19, ll. 33-35. Since Southgate teaches a way to manage multiple windows, and the embodiment of Becker only utilizes a single window, the proposed combination of Southgate and Becker would render Southgate unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would change the principle of operation of Southgate. MPEP § 2143.01.

The combination of Becker and Southgate fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11. Furthermore, combining Southgate and Becker would render Southgate unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would change the principle of operation of Southgate. For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Becker in view of Southgate. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of independent claims 1 and 11 in light of the above remarks.

Dependent claims 2, 5-9, 12, 15-18 and 20 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Becker in view of Southgate. Dependent claims 2, 5-9, 12, 15-18 and 20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 11, and should be allowed for the reasons set out above for the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of dependent claims 2, 5-9, 12, 15-18 and 20.

B. Claims 10 and 19

Claims 10 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Southgate. Becker discloses “to send an instant message ... the user ... moves a mouse cursor over the ‘Send’ command 142 in the session command bar 140 and clicks.” Becker, col. 13, ll. 29-33. Becker does not teach sending a message in response to a user selecting the content in the first interactive content tab, where the message relates to the selected content, as claimed in claims 10 and 19. Becker does not disclose sending a message in response to selecting content nor sending a message that relates to the content selected. Southgate generally “provides

an efficient way to manage windows where multiple windows are used and displayed.” Southgate, col. 5, ll. 17-18. Southgate fails to disclose sending a message in response to a user selecting the content in the first interactive content tab, where the message relates to the selected content, as claimed in claims 10 and 19.

The combination of Becker and Southgate fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11, which dependent claims 10 and 19 depend on, and the combination fails to disclose all of the elements of claims 10 and 19. Furthermore there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Becker and Southgate. For at least these reasons, dependent claims 10 and 19 are not anticipated by Becker in view of Southgate. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of dependent claims 10 and 19 in light of the above remarks.

C. Claims 3, 4, 13 and 14

Dependent claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 stand rejected under Becker in view of Southgate and further in view of Werndorfer2. Werndorfer2 generally relates to an “IM graphical user interface.” Werndorfer2, col. 3, l. 46. Werndorfer2 fails to disclose a resizable content displayed *in a window*, or maintaining a pre-programmed height for a friends list page displayed *in a window*, as claimed in independent claim 1 and 11.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Southgate, Werndorfer2, and the embodiment of Becker relied on by the Office Action. Southgate provides a way to manage windows where multiple windows are used and displayed (Southgate, col. 5, ll. 17-18), while the embodiment relied on in Becker discloses a graphical user interface consolidated in a single window pane set, (Becker, Fig. 12, col. 19 ll. 33-35), and Werndorfer2 relates to a “primary IM client window 1200.” Werndorfer2, col. 6, l. 64. Since Southgate teaches a way to manage multiple windows and the embodiment of Becker, and Werndorfer2, only utilize a single window, the proposed combination of Southgate, Becker, and Werndorfer2 would render Southgate unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would change the principle of operation of Southgate. MPEP § 2143.01.

The combination of Becker, Southgate, and Werndorfer2 fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11, which dependent claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 depend on. Furthermore there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Becker,

Southgate and Werndorfer2 as the combination would render Southgate unsatisfactory for its intended purpose and would change the principle of operation of Southgate. For at least these reasons, dependent claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 are not anticipated by Becker in view of Southgate and further in view of Werndorfer2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of dependent claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 in light of the above remarks.

II. NEW CLAIMS 22-26

Claims 22-26 are added with this amendment. Applicant submits Becker, Southgate, and Werndorfer2, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of new claims 22-26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow claims 22-26.

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated March 17, 2008 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

June 17, 2008

Date

/Michael G. Dreznes/

Michael G. Dreznes

Registration No. 59,965

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200